

REMARKS

The Examiner's continued attention to the present application is noted with appreciation.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 27-40, and 42-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Keizer et al. (hereinafter Keizer). This rejection is traversed, particularly as to the claims as amended.

Applicants graciously thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview on January 22, 2008. During that interview, the Examiner stated that the claims would be allowable if the independent claims were amended to delete the term "plug-in module". Thus, Applicants have amended the claims to delete that term. In addition, claims 56 and 57 were added to more completely claim the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Keizer in view of Adams et al. (hereinafter Adams). This rejection is traversed.

Adams fails to disclose that the internal electrostatic discharge protection diodes provide a source of direct current for the microcontroller as recited in Applicant's claim 52. Instead, Adams teaches using internal electrostatic discharge diodes for protection only (See Adams Col. 3, lines 16-24). In fact, providing an internal electrostatic discharge protection diode for use as a source of direct current, as recited by Applicants, is not even mentioned or contemplated in Adams. In order for Adams to show such a use, Adams would also have to disclose an external alternating current that makes use of the internal electrostatic discharge protection diodes for rectification and no such disclosure is made in Adams. Thus, the combination of Keizer and Adams fails to recite each limitation of Applicant's independent claim 52 as required in MPEP § 2143.03. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants' independent claim 52, as well as dependent claims 53-55, are allowable over the combination of Keizer in view of Adams.

Applicant has responded to each and every ground of rejection advanced by the Examiner without introduction of new matter or raising new issues. However, should the Examiner have any queries, suggestions or comments relating to a speedy disposition of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Authorization is given to charge payment of any additional fees required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct. 13-4213. Enclosed herein is a one month extension of time extending the deadline to January 27, 2008.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Samantha A. Updegraff, Reg. No. 60,139
Direct Dial: (505) 998-6124

PEACOCK MYERS, P.C
Attorneys for Applicant
P.O. Box 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927
Phone: (505) 998-1500
Fax: (505) 243-2542

Customer No. 005179

G:\A-CLIENTS\Nemir-XLSynergy\PAT\10-789496\OA Resp. 012208.doc